

Today I rise to say congratulations to the Denver Broncos and to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Denver won the Super Bowl and our colleague won our friendly little bet. So this morning I presented to my colleague and her staff a month's supply of Georgia peanuts and Atlanta's own Coca-Cola. Enjoy the Coke and peanuts and the victory, while you can.

Next year the Dirty Birds will be back.

A SWEET VICTORY

(Ms. DEGETTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am proud to be standing here today with one of the most esteemed Members of Congress, and also one of the best sports in Congress, the gentleman from Atlanta (Mr. LEWIS) to celebrate our Denver Broncos' victory last Sunday. The Dirty Birds made a valiant effort, I say to my colleague, but our mighty Broncos were just too strong.

The victory was sweet. Its spoils are even sweeter. I would like to thank the Congressman from Atlanta and his staff for delivering the month's supply of Coca-Cola and the peanuts to our office. Very sweet indeed.

A sweet win for Mike Shannahan, who has proven once again he knows football better than any other coach in the NFL. A sweet victory for Terrell Davis, who continually racks up consecutive 100 yard games. But this does set a tradition of Super Bowl dominance. We need a three-peat. We need our quarterback, John Elway, to come back for the three-peat next year.

I would like to thank my colleague the gentleman from Atlanta (Mr. LEWIS) for being such a good sport. We are looking forward to seeing the Dirty Birds in the Super Bowl, and when we three-peat, we know the gentleman will be just as good a sport then as he is now.

POLITICALLY POPULAR PROMISES

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, one of the main reasons the economy has been so strong over the last few years is that following the 1994 elections, we finally started bringing Federal spending under control. Alice Rivlin, who was the President's budget director, put out a memo in 1993 saying that if we did not make changes, we would have deficits of over \$1 trillion a year by the year 2010 and \$4 trillion to \$5 trillion a year by 2030. If we had allowed that to happen, our economy would have crashed. Now we are actually seeing surpluses.

But it is politically popular and very easy to promise everything to everybody. The National Taxpayers' Union

said the President's State of the Union address would require a \$288.4 billion increase in spending in the first year alone. Last week Newsweek magazine published a chart showing we would have a shortfall of \$2.3 trillion in the next 15 years if we enacted all of these programs.

If we do this, Madam Speaker, we will very quickly be in serious trouble in our economy once again. We must not let it happen.

SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY WITH BUDGET SURPLUS

(Mr. CROWLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the President's plan to use the budget surplus to save Social Security. Our country is experiencing record economic growth; inflation is down; job growth and homeownership are up; and we are experiencing the first budget surplus in over a generation. I support the President's plan to use the budget surplus to ensure the long-term fiscal success of the Social Security program.

In my own district of Queens and the Bronx in New York, tens of thousands of people are able to retire with dignity because of the Social Security system. For all American seniors, Social Security is truly an American success story.

Madam Speaker, we must as a Congress work to ensure that this successful American program continues to be fiscally sound and economically successful in order to provide benefits for the baby boomers of today and the retirees of tomorrow. The President's budget ensures the long-term success of the Social Security system by providing tax cuts for working families. I urge my colleagues to support the use of the surplus to save Social Security.

SPENDING PRIORITIES

(Mr. GARY MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. We have heard much debate today about saving Social Security and spending 62 percent of the surplus to do it. I agree with that 100 percent. Our Medicare has to be ensured to be there for our generation and the generation to come. The same is true for defense. How can we expect those defending our Nation to feed their family using food stamps? It is deplorable and we need to change that.

But if we listened to the President's State of the Union, it is obvious big government just came roaring back. When do we start trusting the American people? What do we do with the remaining 38 percent of the surplus if we are going to spend 62 percent for Social Security? Let us give the people their money back.

We talk about making sure we are going to better education for the future. When will we start trusting parents? When will we start trusting school boards? When will we start trusting teachers to provide education?

The Federal Government has 790 various programs associated with education. The mandates associated with those programs generally cost more to implement than they receive from the Federal Government. That has to be changed.

Let us start trusting parents; let us start trusting taxpayers; let us start trusting individuals with their rights.

ONE BAD DEAL

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, a 10 percent across-the-board income tax cut, what could sound more appealing, more simple, more fair?

Hearing those words, hard-working American taxpayers start dreaming about what they could do with the money. Replace that beater with a new car, repair the leaky roof, send their child to college, maybe take that long-awaited second honeymoon. Well, forget it.

The sad truth is that 77 percent of all taxpayers, nearly 35 million people, would receive no tax cut at all. A two-parent family of four with annual income below \$25,000 would get nothing.

So who benefits from that trillion-dollar tax cut over the next decade? Citizens for Tax Justice tell us it is the wealthiest Americans.

Here is the deal. Taxpayers earning \$38,000 get back \$99. Taxpayers earning over \$300,000 get a tax cut of \$20,000. For most of us, this is one bad deal.

ASSURING AMERICA'S FUTURE

(Mr. BRADY of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, let American workers have no doubt who is on their side. Across-the-board tax relief means all taxpayers will get to keep a little more of what they earn, not what Washington earns, what they earn. Unlike the approach offered by the other side whereby only some people get a tax cut while others do not, the Republican approach means that if one pays taxes, if one is giving up one's hard-earned paycheck, one is going to get a little more tax relief.

Our education reforms will cut the Federal bureaucracy and send more money directly down to teachers. Our Social Security reforms will protect seniors who are in the program, the near elderly, the baby boomers like myself, and especially those young people coming into a system they do not believe is ever going to be there when they need it at retirement.

Our proposal to build a long-term 21st century defense system will address new threats to our Nation. That